

MID-TERM REVIEW

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. OVERVIEW	3
A. Description	3
B. Key Dates	3
II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES	4
A. Main MTR Findings	4
B. Stakeholder Engagement	5
C. Gender Equality	5
D. Knowledge Management	5
III. CORE INDICATORS	5
IV: CO FINANCING	7
V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS.....	7
VI. ANNEX	7

I. Overview

A. Description

Project name

Global Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) Platform Phase II B: Unified Support Platform and Program for Article 13 of the Paris Agreement

Country

Global

GEF ID

10088

Implementing Agency

UNEP

Executing Entity

Others

Trust Fund

GET

Project Type

FSP

Objective

To provide streamlined support and capacity building at the country, regional, and global level to enable Non Annex I countries under the UNFCCC and developing countries under the Paris Agreement to better respond to reporting requirements and to catalyze increased ambition within country NDCs to contribute to the stated temperature goal of well below 2 degrees and if possible 1.5 degrees.

B. Key Dates

CEO Endorsement/Approval

12/18/2021

Agency Approval

6/1/2022

Implementation Start

6/1/2022

First Disbursement

9/2/2022

Expected MTR

11/13/2024

MTR Submission

3/3/2025

Actual MTR

12/13/2024

Expected Completion

3/31/2027

II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES

A. Main MTR Findings

The Global Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) Platform Phase II (CBIT-GSP II) comprises two distinct, but closely interlinked projects, IIA and IIB. The objective of the mid-term review (MTR) was to a) assess the implementation status, performance and progress towards results, and b) provide recommendations vis-à-vis the remaining implementation period of CBIT-GSP II and the planned CBIT-GSP III. The MTR was conducted for IIB as per GEF requirements, whereas no MTR was required for IIA. However, due to the close connection between the two projects, which will be followed by a singly project CBIT-GSP Phase III, the MTR covers both IIA and IIB, in order to capture the complete picture and provide relevant recommendations, taking fully into account the results achieved, and challenges experienced.

Key Findings and Conclusions

Strengths: The project is performing well with high level of activity, benefitting from the in-house technical capacities of UNEP-CCC, regional networks enabling engagement at the country level, and a partnership approach with workshops with co-implementation and co-financing by partners and national GEF projects. This has enabled CBIT-GSP II to engage at the country level to a surprising degree, with several in-country trainings and technical advice on how to improve draft reports (NCs, BURs, BTRs). Important partnerships include UNDP and Belgium financing and administering two of the eight regional CBIT-GSP II networks and partnership with the UNFCCC Secretariat. CBIT-GSP II has achieved a high degree of cost-effectiveness through leveraging substantial amounts of co-financing from the partnerships.

CBIT-GSP II's output-related end targets have for the larger part already been achieved or even exceed at mid-term, and with a likelihood of the remaining targets also being achieved before project completion. The support provided by CBIT-GSP II is widely appreciated by country-level beneficiaries, and a clear contribution has been made to enhancing their MRV, transparency/ETF knowledge and capacities. The outcome targets are likely to be achieved, with country-level beneficiaries already (to a significant or moderate extent) applying the knowledge obtained and using the tools for data collection, analysis and reporting, and for setting up ETF institutional arrangements, thus contributing to enhanced compliance with UNFCCC reporting requirements.

CBIT-GSP II directly responds to UNFCCC COP decisions vis-à-vis reporting and climate transparency. The project proactively contributes to improving the coordination among climate transparency support providers. UNEP is preparing a third phase of CBIT-GSP, so the risk of a support gap after the completion of CBIT-GSP II is low. Given the continued obligation to report to UNFCCC, countries are likely to continue applying the skills and tools provided by CBIT-GSP. Key stakeholders are well represented in the PSC, the support is informed by participatory needs assessments, and country-level support is demand-driven. There is equal participation of women and men, and women are well-represented in project management and oversight.

Weaknesses: CBIT-GSP II has been severely affected by external factors outside the control of the project leading to a delayed project start and very limited implementation in 2020-2021, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, the legal and administrative transition of UNEP-CCC from DTU to UNOPS, the withdrawal of UNDP as co-implementing agency, and the resignation of the gender consultant. While implementation picked up, budget execution was still low at the end of 2023 (partly a result of cost-savings due to the high degree of co-implementation and co-financing), which is particular concern for IIA, with only approximately one year of implementation remaining. A human rights lens is not applied in the project, although the contribution to enhanced climate transparency contributes to accountability.

CBIT-GSP II puts considerable efforts into promoting coordination among support providers, but the ownership and use of the Climate Transparency Platform by support providers is uneven, as they partly perceive the platform as a CBIT-GSP II project website rather than a shared platform.

The project design has some shortcomings, including inconsistencies in the ToC and results framework, and indicators not fully capturing the outcomes, which are also not fully reported on. Technical progress reports and financial statements are generally submitted late. Co-financing is underestimated and underreported.

Performance rating: Overall, the project is rated as 'Satisfactory'. (Section V.A.)

B. Stakeholder Engagement

Key stakeholders are well represented in the PSC, with participation of the UNFCCC Secretariat, the GEF Secretariat, and representative from climate transparency support providers, Non-Annex I Parties and Annex I Parties/development partners. Project activities have been informed by participatory assessments of country support needs and priorities. Annual global stocktaking events had to be cancelled during the COVID-19 pandemic, but one was held in early 2024. Country-level support is entirely country-driven and based on requests, and countries are directly involved in the execution of in-country training. Other support providers are considerably engaged in CBIT-GSP II, in particular through the joint implementation of activities, but also through having their own pages on the Climate Transparency Platform. (Section IV.H)

C. Gender Equality

Women are well-presented in CBIT-GSP II, with female participation being slightly above 50 pct female participation. However, the participation of women varies considerably among regions, with a low participation of women in the Francophone network. Women are strongly represented in project management. Relevant project indicators are gender disaggregated as is the data collection, e.g. on workshop participation. The main gender-specific deliverable, a gender toolkit, is yet to be finalized. One gender-related event has been held, and UNEP-CCC has reportedly looked into the integration of gender in the reports submitted by countries and the implementation of the UNFCCC Gender Action Plan. (Section IV.H)

D. Knowledge Management

There was no communication plan in the CEO endorsement request. Nonetheless, outreach is an important element of CBIT-GSP II, in particular IIA, where the second component has an outreach and dissemination focus, although not all outputs and activities under the component have a wider outreach focus. The main elements of the project's knowledge management and outreach efforts are: a) regional networks engage in dialogue with countries and promote peer-to-peer dialogue among countries; b) the Climate Transparency Platform provides public/open access to information about CBIT-GSP II, written products, online events, as well as information about other support providers and technical experts; c) outreach events, i.e. four side events at UNFCCC COP28 (Dubai, 2023) and one at a subsidiary Body meeting (Bonn, 2023); d) participation in events arranged by others, such as UNFCCC COP27 and COP28 side events; e) dialogue with other support providers through the ETF Group of Friends ; and f) a flyer on the main project results disseminated at COP28 and good practice briefs. (Section IV.H)

III. Core Indicators

Indicator 11 People benefiting from GEF-financed investments

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female	250	500	2,989	
Male	250	500	2,710	
Total	500	1000	5,699	0

IV: Co Financing

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Anticipated at CEO(\$)	Materialized at MTR(\$)
Other	UNEP DTU Partnership	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	500000	4273979
Total Co-financing				500,000.00	4,273,979.00

Comments

The reported co-financing includes USD 3,273,979 cash co-financing for two of the ten regional networks (Lusophone Cluster, Francophone Cluster), which are managed by UNDP and funded by the Government of Belgium; USD 30,000 in cash from ICAT, with the remaining being USD 300,000 in-kind from UNEP. However, the figures on realized co-financing only capture part of the contribution from UNEP-CCC (specifically the contribution from UNEP-CCC's engagement in ICAT), and do not capture the significant cash and in-kind co-financing mobilized from multiple sources (incl. other support providers, GEF enabling activities, national CBIT projects, governments) for numerous joint activities at global, regional, and country level; thus leading to underestimation of the realized co-financing. As such, the reported co-financing realized is highly above target, even if the realized co-financing is under-reported.

V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
	Low	Low	

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

CBIT-GSP II has an institutional focus and does not entail any on-the-ground investments, and no environmental or social risks were identified at design, during implementation, or by the TR. The project was thus rated as "Negative impacts minimal or negligible: no further study or impact management required". (Section IV.H)

VI. ANNEX

Uploaded Document

Document Category

M and E Document

Title

MTR CBIT-GSP II_Dec 2024
